

\*E-FILED 05-02-2011\*

NOT FOR CITATION  
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

HAIPING SU,

No. C09-02838 JW (HRL)

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'  
MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER  
RE THE DEPOSITION OF WENDE  
HOWER**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; NATIONAL  
AERONAUTICS AND SPACE  
ADMINISTRATION; CHRISTOPHER  
SCOLESE; CHARLES F. BOLDEN, JR.;  
SIMON PETER WORDEN; ROBERT DOLCI;  
REGINALD WADDELL; and DOES 1-100,

[Re: Docket No. 146]

Defendants.

Defendants move for a protective order re the deposition of Wendé Hower. Plaintiff opposes the motion. The matter is deemed appropriate for determination without oral argument. Civ. L.R. 7-1(b). Upon consideration of the moving and responding papers, this court grants the motion.

Wendé Hower is identified as the person who manages the process by which NASA issues security badges for all employees, contractors, and visitors. In essence, plaintiff wants to depose her about NASA's badging process and decisions generally, as well as NASA's badging process and decisions as to plaintiff.

Judge Ware previously granted summary judgment in defendants' favor on plaintiff's Administrative Procedures Act (APA) claim. (Docket No. 122). In that order, the court found

1 that “the administrative record strongly supports Defendants’ contention that the decision to  
2 debar Plaintiff was premised on the FBI and NASA’s joint investigation, which was  
3 independent of the standard background check associated with the badging process.” (Id. at 8).  
4 Su now contends that, through discovery, he has amassed information showing that, contrary to  
5 the court’s summary judgment ruling, NASA’s badging process and decisions as to him may be  
6 intertwined with the FBI-NASA investigation that led to the decision to remove him from  
7 NASA’s facilities. Plaintiff believes that Hower has information that will show how  
8 intertwined those investigations were.

9 But, the fact remains that Judge Ware’s summary judgment ruling stands. And,  
10 plaintiff’s only claims for relief are for alleged violations of his privacy arising out of the  
11 decision to remove him from NASA’s facilities. As such, this court finds that the testimony  
12 sought is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible  
13 evidence and that the burden and expense of the discovery sought outweighs its likely benefit.  
14 FED. R. CIV. P. 26(b). Defendants’ motion for protective order therefore is granted. If plaintiff  
15 obtains relief resulting in a live claim as to which Hower’s testimony is relevant, then this  
16 court’s ruling is without prejudice to plaintiff to seek Hower’s deposition.

17 SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: May 2, 2011

19   
20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21 HOWARD R. LLOYD  
22 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 5:09-cv-02838-JW Notice has been electronically mailed to:

2 James McManis jmcmanis@mcmanislaw.com, clarsen@mcmanislaw.com

3 Joseph Steven Jarreau steven.jarreau@usdoj.gov

4 Karen Seifert karen.p.seifert@usdoj.gov

5 Michael Gannon Reedy mreedy@mcmanislaw.com, sshakoori@mcmanislaw.com

6 Richard Tyler Atkinson tatkinson@mcmanisfaulkner.com, eschneider@mcmanislaw.com

7 Vesper Mei vesper.mei@usdoj.gov

8 Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel who have not  
9 registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.